

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 13, 20, 21, 24, 25, 29 and 33 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter because support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs 14, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 32, 35, 36, 44 and 48 of the application as originally filed. Claims 4, 5, 14, 16, 17, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice.

Specification

Applicant has amended the Specification at paragraphs 24, 26 and 31 to correct an inconsistent reference number with regard to Figure 3. In particular, Applicant has amended reference number 306 to 316 to conform the Specification to Figure 3. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Drawings

Applicant has amended Figure 2 by changing the reference number for the Media Server to “210” and the Web Service Composition Module to “220,” to conform Figure 2 to the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on June 4, 2009. Applicant summarizes the interview as having discussed the differences between the proposed amendments and the currently cited prior art. No agreement on patentability was reached. The Examiner, however, recommended adding language describing an action being performed and transmitting information associated with the action to the user.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-36

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the web service is not clear, a user is not clear, and whether the user request is ever fulfilled is not clear. Applicant has amended the claims accordingly to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be removed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-36

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046119 (hereinafter “Yamamoto”) in view of Nakagawa, U.S. Patent No. 7,266,376 (hereinafter “Nakagawa”).

Yamamoto discloses a user is at home using a PC to register an action schedule with an action schedule support service. A user determines the order of a plurality of acts to be performed by the user and registers this order as the action schedule. For example, Yamamoto describes a user registering an action schedule including (1) moving by train, (2) seeing a movie, (3) dinner, and (4) moving by train. The user leaves the home with a mobile device and makes a purchase using the mobile device (buys a movie ticket, pays for dinner). The support service detects a user has completed an act and displays the next act on the mobile device.

Nakagawa discloses plan information representing a plan to be executed by the user of a mobile device. A user specifies schedule data to an information providing server and the server stores the schedule data. For example, the user specifies that on October 11, there is a sales meeting from 7:10-11:30, there is meeting with a corporation at 13:30 to 16:30, and the user is to go on board the Hikari Super Express No. 312 departing from Tokyo station at 19:20. The server receives positional

information from the user's mobile phone and searches for a traveling route to the location where the next plan is executed, based on the positional information. The server transmits a traveling route to the mobile phone. If the server determines that the user is travelling too slowly, the server transmits an alert to the mobile phone.

Independent claims 1, 13, 25, 29 and 33 claim generating a service plan to be performed by a plurality of Web Services and translating the service plan into a Web Service composition expressed in a business process modeling language. In contrast, Yamamoto does not generate a service plan *to be performed by a plurality of Web Services* because Yamamoto describes a plan is a plurality of acts scheduled *to be performed by the user*. In addition, nowhere does Yamamoto describe translating the service plan into a Web Service composition expressed in a business process modeling language. Yamamoto only describes that an action schedule to be performed by a user is registered with a support service. Yamamoto, therefore, does not teach each and every element of claims 1, 13, 25, 29 and 33.

Nakagawa also fails to teach or suggest these elements of claims 1, 13, 25, 29 and 33. Nakagawa describes plan information representing a plan *to be executed by the user* of a mobile device, which is not equivalent to a service plan to be performed by a plurality of Web Services. Moreover, Nakagawa describes that a user provides schedule data to an information providing server and the server stores the schedule data, and does not disclose translating the service plan into a Web Service composition expressed in a business process modeling language at all. Nakagawa, therefore, does not teach each and every element of claims 1, 13, 25, 29 and 33.

Therefore, neither Yamamoto nor Nakagawa teaches or suggests generating a service plan to be performed by a plurality of Web Services and translating the service plan into a Web Service composition expressed in a business process modeling language, as claimed.

For the reasons stated above, Yamamoto and Nakagawa, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, 25, 29 and 33 are patentable over the cited references. Given that dependent claims 2-12 depend, either directly or indirectly,

from independent claim 1, claims 15-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 13, claims 26-28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 25, claims 30-32 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 29, and claims 34-36 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 33, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-13 and 15-36 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 16, 2009

/Joan Obispo Arbolante/

Joan Obispo Arbolante

Reg. No 58,642

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300